



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/560,910

12/16/2005

Takeshi Inaba

Q91600

6082

23373 7590 01/21/2009  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

WOOD, ELLEN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1794

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/21/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                                      |                                       |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/560,910 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>INABA, TAKESHI |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>ELLEN S. WOOD     | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1794               |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/12/2008 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blasko et al. (US 6,776,195, hereinafter "Blasko") in view of Inaba et al. (US 6,881,460, hereinafter "Inaba").

In regards to claim 1, Blasko discloses an invention of two or more layer tubular polymeric laminates (col. 1 lines 13-12). The tubular polymeric laminate has an inner fluoropolymer layer (thermoplastic resin layer), an outer nylon layer (polyamide-based resin layer), and another resin layer (thermoplastic polymer layer) bonded directly to the fluoropolymer layer (col. 3 lines 23-43). The preferred polyamide layer consists of nylon

Art Unit: 1794

6, 6/66, 11, 12, or 6/12 (col. 6 lines 41-43). These are also the preferred polyamide layers used by the instant applicant (pg. 13 lines 11-13). The thermoplastic resin is an ethylene based fluoropolymer (col. 6 lines 62-63), thus it would have a carbonyl functional group. The thermoplastic polymer layer is a thermoplastic elastomer such as a polyurethane-based elastomer (col. 9 lines 1-2). The first layer (polyamide) is directly bonded to the second layer (fluoropolymer) through thermal "fusion" bonding (col. 5 lines 41-47 and 55-58).

In regards to claim 5, Blasko discloses that the additional resin layer is selected from a thermoplastic elastomer such as a thermoplastic polyurethane elastomer (col. 9 lines 1-2).

In regards to claim 6, Blasko discloses the preferred polyamide layer consists of nylon 6, 6/66, 11, 12, or 6/12 (col. 6 lines 41-43). These are also the preferred polyamide layers used by the instant applicant (pg. 13 lines 11-13). Thus, it is known to one ordinary skill in the art that the polyamide-based resin has an acid value of not higher than 80 (equivalents/ $10^6$  g).

In regards to claim 8, Blasko discloses that the thickness of the first layer (polyamide) has a thickness of between about 0.025-0.25 in (col. 5 lines 28-29) and the outermost layer (thermoplastic polymer layer) has a thickness of between about 0.02-0.15 in (col. 8 lines 61-62), thus the polyamide layer has a thickness not exceeding one fifth of the thickness of the thermoplastic polymer layer.

In regards to claim 10, Blasko discloses that the modified fluoropolymer materials are able to be fusion bonded, such as by co-extrusion, to additional layers at a temperature ranging between 150-280°C (col. 7 lines 20-25).

In regards to claims 11-12, Blasko discloses that a tube or hose is molded from the two or more layers that have been described (col. 11 lines 18-20).

In regards to claims 13-15, Blasko discloses the tubular polymeric laminate has an inner fluoropolymer layer (thermoplastic resin layer), an outer nylon layer (polyamide-based resin layer), and another resin layer (thermoplastic polymer layer) bonded directly to the fluoropolymer layer (col. 3 lines 23-43). The tube or hose will provide but chemical and environmental resistance from liquids such as fuel, organic, and inorganic solvents (col. 1 lines 21-29).

. Blasko is silent with regards to the amine value of the polyamide based resin, the modulus of elasticity in tension is lower than 400 MPa for the laminate and the total luminous transmittance. Blasko discloses that the nylon is chosen for the reasons of cost, chemical compatibility, flexural modulus, hardness, and other physical properties (col. 6 lines 39-50). Blasko discloses that to enhance the flexibility of the hose, the flexural modulus of the layers may be varied to have overall difference in flexibility (col. 9 lines 48-52). Thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to vary the flexural modulus of the layers of Blasko to form a laminated resin molding that has a modulus of elasticity in tension of lower than 400 MPa.

Blasko forms a multilayer laminated resin molding that has an outermost layer of polyurethane, and intermediate layer of polyamide, and an innermost layer of

Art Unit: 1794

fluoropolymer. Thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that the multilayer laminated resin molding would have a total luminous transmittance of not lower than 75%, because the structure is meant to be light shielding in order have exceptional resistance to chemical degradation and vapor permeation (col. 1 lines 21-22).

Blasko discloses that the preferred polyamide layer consists of nylon 6, 6/66, 11, 12, or 6/12 (col. 6 lines 41-43). These are also the preferred polyamide layers used by the instant applicant (pg. 13 lines 11-13). The hoses and tubing formed from the polymeric compositions may be formed by co-extrusion without the use of an adhesive or tie layer (col. 3 lines 10-14). The advantages of the tubular composite structure are the enhanced resistance to internal and external chemicals and moisture (col. 3 lines 57-65). The specific nylon chosen are for reasons such as cost, service temperature, chemical compatibility with the fluid being handled, fluid, solvent, moisture or environmental resistance, flexural modulus, hardness, or other physical properties (col. 6 lines 43-50).

Inaba discloses a multilayer molding having a polyamide based resin as an outer layer and a fluorine containing resin as an inner layer (abstract). Polyamide based resin shows an unsatisfactory level of adhesion strength when the polyamide based resin has an amine value of less than 10 (equivalents/ $10^6$ g) (col. 4 lines 9-19). The mechanical properties of the laminates were inferior when the amine value exceeded 60 (equivalents/ $10^6$ g) (col. 4 lines 20-21). Thus, it was discovered that an amine value of

Art Unit: 1794

10 to 35 (equivalents/ $10^6$ g) provided the most satisfactory level of adhesion strength while maintaining mechanical properties.

Thus, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the polyamide based resin with the amine values as seen in Inaba would be applied to the polyamide based resin of Blasko to produce a polyamide resin with the optimal adhesion and mechanical properties in a multilayer resin molding.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 5-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant argues that the amine value of the polyamide-based resin is outside the claimed range then the laminated molding has inferior properties. The examiner has included the Inaba reference to demonstrate that it has been discovered and is known to one of ordinary skill in the art that when the amine value of the polyamide base resin is within the claimed range of applicant the multilayered moldings have improved adhesive strength and mechanical properties.

The applicant argues the simultaneous multilayer coextrusion technique is not shown in the Blasko reference. Absent a showing to the contrary, it is Examiner's position that the article of the applied prior art is identical to or only slightly different than the claimed article. Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in

Art Unit: 1794

the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The burden has been shifted to Applicant to show unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The applied prior art either anticipated or strongly suggested the claimed subject matter. It is noted that if Applicant intends to rely on Examples in the specification or in a submitted declaration to show unobviousness, Applicant should clearly state how the Examples of the present invention are commensurate in scope with the claims and how the Comparative Examples are commensurate in scope with the applied prior art.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELLEN S. WOOD whose telephone number is (571)270-3450. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 730-5 with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571)272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. Lawrence Tarazano/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794